UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,872	04/16/2001	Mark Vange	CIRC019	5576

25235 7590 10/19/2005

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEENTH ST
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER	
EL HADY, NABIL M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/835,872	VANGE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nabil M. El-Hady	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-12, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore et al. (Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users, 1999), hereinafter "Bickmore".

5. Bickmore is cited by the applicant in IDS paper filed 11/25/2002.

6. As per claim 1, Bickmore discloses the invention as claimed including a method for delivering network resources comprising the acts of: establishing request-response traffic between a first and second computer (User and Web Server, Fig. 1; and sec. 3, The Digestor System); and reformatting the request/response traffic at least once in at least one intermediary computer (Digestor Proxy, Fig. 1) between the first and second computer (sec 3.1 overview), wherein the reformatting comprises resolving links within the request/response traffic to identify network resources pointed to by the links and retrieving resources pointed to by the links (sec. 3.3.3., 5th paragraph paragraph; and sec. 3.4.2., 1st paragraph).

7. Bickmore does not explicitly disclose embedding resources pointed to by the links in-line with other data in the request/response traffic and, hence, forwarding the request/response traffic after embedding. However, Bickmore discloses that Digestor intercepts requests for web pages and returns re-authored versions rather than the original pages, (sec. 3.1, 1st paragraph). The original pages may be interpreted as including all pages and linked pages. Bickmore, also, discloses that as Digestor supports cellular phones which have very small text display and do not support links embedded in the text, so the re-authoring capability of the Digestor resolves this issue (sec. 3.1, 2nd paragraph). Resolving all links and embedding them has to be a first step in the re-authoring capability. Bickmore discloses an initial study for manual re-authoring (sec. 3.2) where a collection of typical web pages of the Xerox Corporate web site was selected and manually converted. This process clearly resolves links and embeds them to form one entity for manual re-authoring. Bickmore, also, discloses retrieving any embedded images so that their size can be determined (sec. 3.3.3. 5th paragraph). Bickmore, also, discloses that handheld device HDML 2.0 does not support images and embedded links so that alternative means have to be used to present navigation choices (sec. 3.3.4), and that navigation within a webpage is based on current content (sec. 3.4.3.3rd paragraph). This may be interpreted that all links in an original page has to be resolved first in order for an alternative means to be used to present navigation choices. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use Bickmore ideas to resolve links within the request/response traffic to identify network resources pointed to by the links; retrieve sources pointed to by the links; embed resources pointed to by the links in-line with other data in the request/response traffic in order to apply the re-authoring activity; and then forward the request/response traffic after embedding, and use other simple alternative means to present navigation choices that is based on current content and more suitable to handheld device.

8. As per claim 2, Bickmore discloses the first computer comprises a client (User, Fig. 1) and the second computer comprises a serve (Web Server, Fig. 1), and the act of establishing request response traffic comprises: generating a client request specifying resources available on the server (process 1, Request for URL, Fig. 1; and sec. 3.1 Overview); retrieving the specified resources (process 3, Fig. 1; and sec. 3.1 Overview); generating a response to the client request in the server (process 3, WWW page, Fig. 1) and at least one of the intermediary computers (processes 4 and 5, Fig. 1); and forwarding the server response after reformatting from the at least one intermediary server to the client (processes 5 and 7, Fig. 1 of Digestor proxy; and sec. 3.1 Overview).

9. As to claims 3-11, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-2 above. In addition, Bickmore establishes by his disclosure a proxy server that interfaces a request response traffic between a first computer and a second computer for the purpose of performing content conversion in the proxy itself. It is well known in the art to use such proxy servers to perform variety of special functional processes for content conversion (see, for example Bickmore, sec. 2.4, lines 6-21) instead of performing these special functions on the first computer or the second computer. Performing these special functions, e.g. conversion, transformation, reformatting, or translation, on an intermediate proxy server would conserve communication bandwidth and computer memory (see, for example, Bickmore, sec. 2.5). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use such proxy server to perform any type of content conversion including converting graphic data format, converting executable program constructs, converting a java script and an ActiveX component, converting formatted text, converting between different text languages, converting hypertext link

from absolute to relative, converting between different markup languages, converting document formats, converting compression level. Anyone of these types of content conversion is well known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention, and would be implemented in Bickmore intermediate proxy server in order to achieve content conversion for universal request response traffic with conservation of communication bandwidth and computer memory (see, for example, Bickmore, sec. 2.5). Claims 3-11 include limitations as naming different types of content conversions that do not by them introduce any novelty as these conversions are well known and obvious to one skilled in that art. Utilizing Bickmore's system to a variety of content conversion processes does not make it novel either.

10. As per claim 12, Bickmore discloses considering special needs of the client during the reformatting (sec. 2.4, Automatic re-authoring).

11. As per claim 15, Bickmore discloses the reformatting comprises reformatting data included in responses only (processes 4 and 5, Fig. 1).

12. As to claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

13. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Carlino (GB 2344197 A).

14. Carlino is cited by the applicant in IDS paper filed 7/26/2002.

15. As to claim 13, Bickmore does not disclose reformatting at least once in a second intermediary computer. Carlino, on the other hand, discloses reformatting at least once in a second intermediary computer (122, 124, and 126, Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bickmore and Carlino in order to speed up a multi reformatting processes by performing each reformatting process in a different intermediate computer.

16. As per claim 14, Carlino does not explicitly disclose undo of at least some of the reformatting of the first computer in the second computer. However, Carlino discloses a number of conversion operations that are performed in different computer and in accordance with a conversion script (Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that a conversion script may as well include undo of at least some of the reformatting of one of the computers in a second computer in order to satisfy the requirements for certain communication protocols for example.

17. Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Lippert et al. (US 6,626,957), hereinafter "Lippert".

18. As to claim 22, Bickmore does not necessarily disclose reformatting components comprise processes converting from a first markup language to a second markup language. Lippert, on the other hand, discloses the reformatting components comprise processes converting from a first markup language to a second markup language (abstract). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bickmore and Lippert in order to able to deal with information in other formats.

19. As to claims 18-21, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 22 above. In addition, Lippert establishes by his disclosure a proxy server (ENGINE) that interfaces a request response traffic between a first computer and a second computer for the purpose of performing content conversion in the proxy itself. It is well known in the art to use such proxy servers to perform variety of special functional processes for content conversion instead of performing these special functions on the first computer or the second computer. Performing these special functions, e.g. conversion, transformation, reformatting, or translation, on an intermediate proxy server would conserve communication bandwidth and computer memory. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use such proxy server to perform any type of content conversion including graphic data format conversion, compilation, media file conversion, and data compression. Anyone of these types of content conversion is well known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention, and would be implemented in Lippert's intermediate ENGINE in order to achieve content conversion for universal request response traffic with conservation of communication bandwidth and computer memory. Claims 18-21 include limitations as naming different types of content conversions that do not by them introduce any novelty as these conversions are well known and obvious to one skilled in that art. Utilizing Lippert's system to a variety of content conversion processes does not make it novel either.

20. Applicant's arguments filed 7/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore the rejection of claims 1-22 is maintained.

21. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that Bickmore et al. do not teach or suggest retrieving resources pointed to by a link and embedding them in-line with other data as claimed by applicant's invention.

22. Examiner respectfully traverses applicants' remarks.

23. As explained above in the rejection of claims 1 and 17, Bickmore does not explicitly disclose embedding resources pointed to by the links in-line with other data in the request/response traffic and, hence, forwarding the request/response traffic after embedding. However, Bickmore discloses that Digestor intercepts requests for web pages and returns re-authored versions rather than the original pages, (sec. 3.1, 1st paragraph). The original pages may be interpreted as including all pages and linked pages. Bickmore, also, discloses that as Digestor supports cellular phones which have very small text display and do not support links embedded in the text, so the re-authoring capability of the Digetor resolves this issue (sec. 3.1, 2nd paragraph). Resolving all links and embedding them has to be a first step in the re-authoring capability. Bickmore discloses an initial study for manual re-authoring (sec. 3.2) where a collection of typical web pages of the Xerox Corporate web site was selected and manually converted. This process clearly resolves links and embeds them to form one entity for manual re-authoring. Bickmore, also, discloses retrieving any embedded images so that their size can be determined (sec. 3.3.3., 5th paragraph). Bickmore, also, discloses that handheld device HDML 2.0 does not support images and embedded links so that alternative means have to be used to present navigation choices (sec. 3.3.4), and that navigation within a webpage is based on current content (sec. 3.4.3.3rd paragraph). This may be interpreted that all links in an original page has to be resolved first in order for an alternative means to be used to present

navigation choices. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use Bickmore ideas to resolve links within the request/response traffic to identify network resources pointed to by the links; retrieve sources pointed to by the links; embed resources pointed to by the links in-line with other data in the request/response traffic in order to apply the re-authoring activity; and then forward the request/response traffic after embedding, and use other simple alternative means to present navigation choices that is based on current content and more suitable to handheld device.

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nabil M. El-Hady whose telephone number is (571) 272-3963. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

October 17, 2005

Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2152